

## REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **29 May 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-37. Claims 1, 6, 12, 13, 24 25, 30, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on Gordon (USPN 7,043,701 B2, hereinafter “Gordon”). Claims 2-4, 14-16 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Gordon based on DeStefano (USPN 6,874,123 B1, hereinafter “DeStefano”). Claims 2-4, 14-16 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Gordon based on DeStefano. Claims 5, 17 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Gordon based on Cook et al. (USPN 6,822,662 B1, hereinafter “Cook”). Claims 7-11, 19-23 and 31-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Gordon based on Miller (USPN 6,597,385 B2, hereinafter “Miller”).

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 6, 12, 13, 24 25, 30, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on Gordon. Claims 2-4, 14-16 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Gordon in view of DeStefano (USPN 6,874,123 B1, hereinafter “DeStefano”). Claims 5, 17 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Gordon in view of Cook. Claims 7-11, 19-23 and 31-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Gordon in view Miller.

Applicant first wishes to point out that USPN 6,597,385 **is not by Miller et al**, but instead by Dirk Verdyck, and is entitled “Method for thermal printing.” Presumably Examiner has inadvertently given the wrong patent number. If Examiner meant a different patent from USPN 6,597,385, a corrected patent number is kindly requested,

Applicant also wishes to submit that embodiments of the present invention are directed to displaying a 2D window as a 3D object which can be rotated. Moreover, the “spine” of such a 3D window can display additional identification information for the underlying application for the window. This additional

identification information can facilitate window operation when the window is tilted or pushed to a side. See FIG. 4B and paragraph [0063] of the instant application.

In rejecting the corresponding dependent claims (e.g., claim 10), Examiner pointed to “Col. 7, lines 4-45.” Examiner did not specify whether this reference is for Gordon or Miller. Applicant assumes that this reference is meant to refer to Gordon. However, **nothing in the referenced portion in Gordon mentions anything about displaying identification information on the spine of a rotated 3D window.** In fact, neither Gordon, nor any of the other references discloses displaying information on the spine of a 3D object.

Accordingly, Applicant has re-written dependent claims 10, 22, and 34 in independent forms as claims 1, 13, 25, and 37. Claims 10, 22, and 34 have been cancelled. These amendments find support in FIG. 4B and paragraph [0063] of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-9, 11, 12, which depend upon claim 1, claims 14-21, 23, 24, which depend upon claim 13, and claims 26-33, 35, 36 which depend upon claim 35, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/  
Shun Yao  
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 29 August 2007

Shun Yao  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95618-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1667  
Fax: (530) 759-1665  
Email: shun@parklegal.com